

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 17-25 were rejected under section §112, first paragraph. Claim 17 has been amended to delete recitation of the “rod” and that term has been replaced with the term “stabilizing bar”. The specification discloses the claimed stabilizing bar. Therefore, this rejection under §112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 17-25 were rejected under §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The previously claimed rod is the same element as the presently claimed stabilizing bar. Therefore, this rejection under §112 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 17-22, 24 and 25 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by Lahu. The Examiner also indicated that claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejections of §112. Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 23, and claim 23 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection under §102 should be withdrawn and claims 17-22, 24 and 25 should also be allowed.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: _____

Brent P. Johnson

Registration No. 38,031

1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

Date: _____

1/4/07